

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the comments made herein.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 4 has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-10 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sigl (US 5,642,260) in view of Shimba (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. H08-99182). For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. Neither Sigl nor Shimba, independently or in combination, teaches or suggests a heat radiating unit including two or more rows of cavity portions. The Examiner concedes that Sigl fails to disclose the use of two or more rows of cavity portions; and thus relies on Shimba in an attempt to make up for the deficiencies of Sigl.

With regards to Shimba, the Examiner states that the abstract discloses and Figs. 3-6 show two rows of cavity portions exist within the box body and are divided so that respective fans 74 provide air stream flows through the respective cavity portions. Applicants strongly disagree. The abstract of Shimba merely states that air is stirred by rotating a fan 74 in the unit box body 12 in a substantially closed condition to develop an air stream. (Although labeled as reference number 72 in the abstract, the unit box body will be correctly referred to with reference number 12 herein.) There is nothing within the abstract of Shimba that discloses, teaches, or suggests two or more rows of cavity portions provided in the box body 12. While it is admitted that Figs. 3-6 of Shimba show two fans 74, these fans 74 provide air to only one cavity. This is clearly seen in at least Figs. 4 and 5. There is no division shown in these Figures that would indicate two or more cavities. While there are components positioned on a bottom portion of the cavity (e.g., cooling plate 60, inverter circuit 62, rectifier circuit 64 capacitors 66) and other components positioned on a top portion of the cavity (e.g., support plate 68 and inverter drive circuits 70), these components do not form two or more separate cavities, as required by the present claims. Further, as mentioned in paragraph [0020] of Shimba, the perpendicular support plate 68 is formed on a cooling plate 60, and inverter drive circuits 70 or other power system

components, whose heat generation are relatively low, are mounted in this support plate 68. The control board 36 is mounted horizontally on the upper plate 20c through the collar 72. Thus, a plurality of cavities are not shown in this reference. No other structure dividing the body 12 into at least two cavities is shown or described in Shimba. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants invite the Examiner to point to a reference number or structure which shows a division of the box body 12 into two or more cavities.

Because neither Sigl nor Shimba teaches or suggests a heat radiating unit including two or more rows of cavity portions, as required by claim 1, the combination of Sigl and Shimba cannot render obvious claim 1 or any claims depending from claim 1. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (US 6,888,099) in view of Shimba (Japanese Patent Application Publication No. H08-99182). For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed. Neither Schneider nor Shimba, independently or in combination, teaches or suggests a heat radiating unit including two or more rows of cavity portions, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner concedes that Schneider fails to disclose the use of two or more rows of cavity portions; and thus relies on Shimba in an attempt to make up for the deficiencies of Schneider. As discussed in greater detail above, Shimba does not teach, disclose, or suggest that the box body 12 includes two or more cavities. While two fans 74 are used to provide air into the box body 12, both fans 74 blow air into a single cavity. It is clear from at least Figs. 4 and 5 that there is no division between the top portion of the box 12 in which fan 74 is mounted and the bottom portion of the box 12 in which second fan 74 is mounted. Again, if the Examiner maintains the contention that Shimba does show at least two cavities, Applicants request that the Examiner specifically point to which reference number(s) shows the division in the box 12. The Examiner cannot be referring to reference numbers 60 and 68, as these components are merely vertical support plates upon which electrical components are mounted.

For at least these reasons, neither Schneider nor Shimba, individually or in combination, teach or suggest each and every limitation set forth in claim 1. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the

application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned agent to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 39712.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

Date: October 2, 2007

/Una L. Lauricia/

Una L. Lauricia, Reg. No. 48998

1801 East 9th Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700